

REMARKS

New Claims 41 - 82 have been substituted for Claims 1 - 40, now cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 41 - 82 are pending. Claims 41 and 67 are independent claims.

Claims 1 - 5, 12, 18, 19, and 21 - 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Duruoz et al ("Duruoz"), U.S. Patent 6,363,207, in view of Oda et al ("Oda"), U.S. Patent 6,157,674. Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Duruoz and Oda in view of Nuber et al ("Nuber"), U.S. Patent 5,703,877. Claims 15 - 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Duruoz and Oda in view of Terashima et al ("Terashima"), U.S. Patent 6,163,647. Claims 6 - 7, 20, and 28 - 34 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Duruoz and Oda in view of Maturi et al ("Maturi"), U.S. Patent 5,559,999. Claims 37 and 38 have been rejected 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Duruoz, Oda, Maturi, and Nuber, in view of Terashima. Finally, Claims 39 and 40 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious based on Maturi in view of Oda and Nuber.

The foregoing rejections have been obviated by the cancellation of Claims 1 - 40. In this regard, Applicants' Attorney does not acquiesce to the reasons presented by the Examiner for rejecting Claims 1 - 40. Instead, replacement Claims 41 - 82 are being substituted for earlier Claims 1 - 40 because Claims 41 - 82 are of more interest to Applicants' assignee.

Each of new independent Claims 41 and 67 specifies that data packets are demultiplexed and depacketized without interrupting a control unit that controls the decoding of encoded video data stored in a video input buffer without the video timing information for the encoded video data. More particularly, Claims 41 and 67 each recite that (a) "an incoming data stream comprises data packets each comprising at least one of (i) encoded video data and a video header that contains video timing information for the encoded video data and (ii) encoded audio data and an audio header that contains audio timing information for the encoded audio data", (b) the data packets are demultiplexed and depacketized without interrupting a control unit, (c) the encoded video data is stored in a video input buffer without the video timing information, (d) the control unit is provided with video messages identifying where the encoded video data is stored in the video input buffer and also dealing with the video timing information, and (e) the encoded video data is decoded to produce decoded

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney at Law
210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA
94043-4869
Tel.: 650-964-9767
Fax: 650-964-9779

video data utilizing video instructions provided from the control unit as to where the encoded video data is stored in the video input buffer.

None of the references, including Suzuki, U.S. Patent 6,148,135, variously cited against earlier Claims 1 - 40 discloses demultiplexing and depacketizing data packets without interrupting a control unit that controls the decoding of encoded video data that is stored in a video input buffer without the associated video timing information. For example, in Duruoz, RISC 80 which controls video decoding as described in col. 12 is interrupted during packet demultiplexing and depacketizing to assign addresses for the encoded video data as described in cols. 7 - 9. A similar procedure occurs in Maturi. Host microcontroller 18 which is interrupted during packet demultiplexing and depacketizing ("parsing") in Maturi to extract timing information (presentation time stamps) from the video headers as described at cols. 5 and 6 controls the video decoding as described at cols. 6 and 7. Neither Duruoz nor Maturi meets the non-interrupt requirement of Claim 41 or 67.

In Suzuki, encoded video data and the associated video timing information (video stamps) are both stored in video buffer memory 45 as described at cols. 8 and 9. Suzuki does not meet the requirement of Claim 41 or 61 that encoded video data be stored in a video input buffer without the video timing information. Oda likewise fails to disclose this limitation. As far as Applicants' Attorney can determine, none of the references variously applied against the earlier claims discloses demultiplexing and depacketizing data packets without interrupting an control unit that controls the decoding of encoded video data stored in a video input buffer without the associated video timing information.

Nothing in the applied references would provide a person skilled in the art with any motivation or suggestion for combining any of the applied references so as to achieve a decoder system in which demultiplexing and depacketizing of data packets is performed without interrupting a control unit that controls the decoding of encoded video data stored in a video input buffer without the associated video timing information. Consequently, Claims 41 and 67 are patentable over the various references applied against the earlier claims.

Claims 42 - 66 variously depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 41.

Claims 68 - 82 variously depend (directly or indirectly) from Claim 67. Dependent Claims 42 - 66 and 68 - 82 are thus patentable over the applied references for the same reasons as Claims 41 and 67.

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney at Law
210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA
94043-4869
Tel.: 650-964-9767
Fax: 650-964-9779

In short, new Claims 41 - 82 are patentable over the various references applied against the earlier claims. Subject to further examination, Claims 41 - 82 should be allowed so that the application may proceed to issue.

Please telephone Attorney for Applicant(s) at 650-964-9767 if there are any questions.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:

EV 337 115 407 US

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald J. Meetin

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 29,089

210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94043-4869

Ronald J. Meetin
Attorney at Law
210 Central Avenue
Mountain View, CA
94043-4869

Tel.: 650-964-9767
Fax: 650-964-9779